

Mr. David R. Dunn
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 3616

+1 571 273 6670
+1 703 872 9306

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUN 15 2005

Dr. -Ing. Giok Djien Go

phone/fax +49 6126 8949

Your OAS (E11) of 06/10/2005
10/690,742 "Anti-submarining seat-belt assembly"
Docket No.: G6A4

- (E1) My amended application of 03/24/2004, registered on 04/05/2004 by USPTO
- (E2) Mrs Draper's OAS (Office Action Summary) of 06/23/2004
- (E3) My letter of 08/06/2004 incl. the first amended application and drawings, registered on 09/02/2004 (?) by USPTO, to Mrs. Draper
- (E4) Your first OAS of 02/25/2005
- (E5) My 4-page objection of 04/12/2005, incl. my amended application, to your OAS (E4) regarding the status and verdict
- (E6) Your Advisory Action of 04/26/2005; Deadline 10/26/2005
- (E7) My objection, faxed on 05/05, 16 and 17/ 2005, to Monages's invention (E6)
- (E8) My objection, faxed on 05/18/2005, to US 4,402,548
- (E9) Your amended claims, dated 05/24/ 2005, in regard with allowance.
- (E10) My response of 05/25/2005 to (E9)
- (E11) Your second OAS of 06/10/2005; Deadline 09/10/2005

Dear Mr. Dunn,

15 June, 2005

Thank you for your OAS (E11), which was delivered, unfortunately, without the US 5,257,854 (Korneliussen). Would you mail it to me please? Thanks.

You have offered me the allowance (E9), for sure, under the premise that the replacement- and annotated marked-up sheets (drawings) (E3) have absolutely complied with 37 CFR xx. Noteworthy, you have already reviewed them and never objected thereto since 09/02/2004 until 06/10/2005. Only the both last sheets 8/8, in which Figs. 12 to 14 are drawn, must be removed if this is your objection.

As I mentioned in (E10), the Claim 25 was already disclosed in (E1) as Claim 19. Hence, it is not a new matter.

Thanks to the terminology "consisting of (comprising) at least one shoulder belt portion (1.1, 1.2) of the Claim 1 in line 3 the features of that Claim can be put into use in collaboration with a three-point seat belt as well as with a multi-point seat belt. For sure, I amend this Claim, suited only for a three-point seat belt, and the Claims 26 and xx, suited only for a multi-point seat belt.

I am absolutely sure that the feature of the reference US 5,257,854, you cited, has nothing to do with my invention just like your previous ones US 4,402,548 and US 5,524,928 because the examiners of DPMA (German Patent Office), EPO and CIPO have never cited it. Please see CIPO's examination report, attached to (E5). After evaluating it I will phone you for discussion.

Thank you for your help and attention in advance.

Kind regards

Go Giok Djien

Go

USPTO-G6A4;15.06.2005

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

Dr.-Ing. Giok Djien Go
Pfehlgrabenstr. 45
D-65510 Idstein
Germany